

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

JUAN BRADLEY,)	8:10CV443
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	MEMORANDUM
)	AND ORDER
CORPORAL PERRY, FRED)	
BRITTEN, Warden, and WARREN)	
K. URBOM,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the court on its own motion. On January 12, 2011, the court dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint without prejudice and entered Judgment against him. (Filing Nos. [9](#) and [10](#).) On January 18, 2011, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Appeal of the court's Judgment. (Filing No. [11](#).) However, Plaintiff did not submit the \$455.00 appellate filing fee, nor did he submit a motion to proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP"). (*See* Filing No. [12](#).) Plaintiff was not previously given leave to proceed IFP in the district court.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff shall have until February 14, 2011, to either submit the \$455.00 appellate filing fee or a Motion to Proceed IFP, with the required affidavit. If Plaintiff takes no action, his appeal will not be processed.
2. Plaintiff is reminded that the Prison Litigation Reform Act makes the prisoner liable for payment of the full \$455.00 appellate filing fee regardless of the outcome of the appeal. An incarcerated civil appellant is required to pay the full amount of the \$455.00 filing fee by making monthly payments to the court, even if he is proceeding in forma pauperis. [28 U.S.C. § 1915\(b\)](#).

3. The Clerk of the court shall not process the appeal in this matter pending further order of the court.

DATED this 24th day of January, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

Richard G. Kopf
United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.